

CACC MEETING MINUTES

COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Thursday, January 19, 2012
10:00 AM - 12:30 PM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007



AUDIO PHONE NUMBER: 1-602-425-3192
AUDIO ACCESS CODE: 1114#

MEMBERS PRESENT

Kip Anderson (*Gary Krcmarik, proxy*)
Cathy Clarich
Julie Dybas
Mary Hawkins
Donald Jacobson
Phillip Knox
Patrick McGrath
Richard McHattie
Michael Malone
Rona Newton
Michael Pollard, *Chair*
Paul Thomas
Rick Rager

GUESTS

Steve Ballance*, *Pima Superior Court*
John Barrett, *Maricopa Superior Court*
Jennifer Gilbertson, *Phoenix Municipal Court*
Lauren Lupica, *City of Mesa*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Patricia Noland

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Karl Heckart, *ITD*
Melissa Hinojosa, *ITD*
Bob Macon, *ITD*
Adele May, *ITD*
Jim Price, *ITD*
Jim Scorza, *ITD*
Renny Rapier, *ITD*

* indicates appeared by telephone

CACC MEETING MINUTES

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Judge Michael Pollard, Chair, called the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. and took a roll call of members. Staff confirmed that a quorum, existed. He then requested members' input regarding the December minutes.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes of the December 15, 2011, CACC meeting as written. The motion passed unanimously.

PACC UPDATE

No PACC meeting has taken place since the last CACC meeting.

REVIEW OF CHANGES TO MINDMAP THIS MONTH

Staff member Stewart Bruner focused attention on two projects that had their deliverable dates change during the month. He stated that the respective project managers would share details later in the meeting. MindMap printouts were made available for members' reference in the meeting. Stewart also announced that Cyndi Samuel, the AOC's software release manager, recently departed for a job at Northern Arizona University.

JOLTSaz- PROJECT UPDATE

Bob Macon, Probation Automation Project Manager at the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), informed members that the juvenile needs assessment tool, AZYAS, was successfully implemented in the rural counties last month but not in Maricopa County, due to some middleware difficulties. Pima County will not use the assessment tool until JOLTSaz rolls out.

Bob explained the rationale behind changing the implementation date for Pima AGAVE/CAMMS/JOLTSaz integration to April 2. The new date allows 5 weeks of training for the over 500 users of the system. Steve Ballance was cautiously optimistic that all necessary work would be accomplished by the go-live date. In response to members' questions about the slip, Rona Newton described the challenge of successfully dividing a single, monolithic system into parts of four separate systems that all must integrate flawlessly. Testing continues to reveal issues that must be addressed by further development, then additional testing. This situation has lengthened the schedule from 1 month to 9 months. Rona also described the way conversion and cutover will be handled during a regular weekend rather than having to wait for another 3-day weekend.

AZTURBOCOURT-RELATED PROJECT UPDATES

Jim Price, AZTurboCourt Project Manager at the AOC, reminded members that general civil e-filing is in the pilot phase at Pima Superior Court so that issues can be worked out while the filing volume remains low. Sean Abrigo from the Clerk's Office has been a key problem solver. The pilot of small claims at Maricopa Justice Courts has been delayed until February 8 while the list of "showstoppers" continues to be addressed. John Barrett explained that resources were diverted to the recent iCIS hardware and database move, reducing their availability for OBOL and CR MDE integration testing. Jim shared that MCJC's practice of scanning all documents in each case as a single file will be changed, but not in time for the pilot implementation. He also shared a concern about the length of the OBOL rollout to the 22 courts beyond the pilot four. He cited the precedent for the iCIS justice courts development project being marked complete when the initial court entered production status rather than waiting for the 26th court to enter

production. In response to a question from the chair, Jim described how certain MCJC required enhancements like party matching will have value to all courts and will be leveraged once developed and tested.

Jim also provided an update on the progress of criminal e-filing and answered members' questions on the subject, including how the current effort relates to the work of the consultant early last year, what relationship exists between e-citation and criminal e-filing processes, and how ADRS is being involved in the effort. Discussion elaborated the breadth of the effort and the large number of political issues involved, leading members to question the reality of the September 2012 date provided on the MindMap. Jim labeled the date as "aspirational." A suggestion was made to break criminal e-filing into smaller projects in order to make steady progress on a very large and complex endeavor.

POST-IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS

Bob Macon combined the AZYAS rural implementation update with his earlier JOLTSaz update.

RESETTING DATES AND REVEALING CONFLICT POINTS

The chair reintroduced the topic of exposing resource conflict points among projects and displayed a master view of priority projects and their predicted durations. Karl Heckart stated that the emphasis of this meeting is on probation automation and e-filing conflicts, following last meeting's emphasis on case management systems (CMSs). The process of asking AOC and court IT managers to describe resource constraints has yielded no clear conflict points but many verbal caveats. In light of that, it is prudent to proceed on the timelines previously shared with COT. Focus then changed to the vendors' capacities and what to do if the things mentioned in the project managers' caveats actually happen. A list of priorities would therefore be useful, even if the status quo is maintained. Karl turned over creation of that list of priorities to CACC members after emphasizing the need for associating productivity gains and business impacts with each project.

Some members were interested in learning more details about contractual agreements with vendors for achieving various volumes of activity by various dates. Other members were interested in whether the vendors were committed to provide whatever resources were necessary to meet the timelines shown on the chart of priority projects. After much discussion about timing, impacts, and benefits to various court constituencies, the fact that CMS enhancements underlie the delivery of almost every improvement in business function became evident. A suggestion was made to prioritize the contents of upcoming CMS releases rather than prioritizing the non-CMS projects that depend on them.

The chair asked members' for consensus regarding the project timelines separate from the priorities, understanding that adjustments will be made if the vendor cannot deliver on the agreed schedule. Paul Thomas shared Mesa's perspective on limited jurisdiction (LJ) and general jurisdiction (GJ) CMS enhancements in relation to AZTEC replacement and large volume needs that could jeopardize their mainframe replacement timeline. Judge Pollard asked for other "drop-dead" dates driving priority projects. Discussion focused on e-filing in the rural counties and the statewide implementation of JOLTSaz. While both affect clerks of the superior court, the sense was that GJ fixes remain a higher priority to them.

Following discussion about LJ functionality being improved by GJ enhancements and vice versa, Karl listed a some priorities grounded in CMS enhancements. In talking through those items, members arrived at the following priority set:

1. LJ Mesa/Large Volume CMS
2. GJ Enhancements and Fixes
3. LJ AZTEC Replacement
4. JOLTSaz Integration
5. E-filing in Rural Courts
6. APETS Integration

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to keep current timelines in place and recommend the project priorities as recorded from discussion in the event resource constraints appear. The motion passed with one nay vote.

PREPARATION FOR FEBRUARY 10 COT MEETING

The plan is to inform COT that CACC, as the result of research and discussion, has identified CMS enhancements as the overarching priority, considered the system-wide improvements in AJACS development for different court types, and recommends timelines from November remain. The CACC priority list will also be shared with COT members for their consideration, in case the vendor is incapable of delivering on schedule or a future resource allocation conflict arises.

ITEMS OF OLD OR NEW BUSINESS

No items of old or new business were raised.

The next meeting will take place in **Room 230** of the **State Courts Building** on **February 16, 2012**.

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.